REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in view of the present amendment and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

After entry of this amendment, Claims 1-8 and 31-54 are pending. Claims 1-8 are amended, and Claims 47-54 are newly added. No new matter is introduced.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-8 and 31-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narasimhan (U.S. Patent No. 6,073,165, hereafter Narasimhan) in view of Moon (U.S. Patent No. 6,138,146, hereafter Moon) and Pivowar (U.S. Patent No. 6,457,062, hereafter Pivowar).

In reply, Claim 1 is amended to recite, *inter alia*, a method for forwarding email that includes:

> obtain new email events from the email datastore when the start criteria are met, *the new email events including transactional information indicating a status of the email stored in the email datastore of the email server;* forward information including the new email events via a computer network to a datastore associated with the server...(Emphasis added.)

Turning to the primary reference, Narasimhan describes a method for a processing and forwarding system that receives messages over a computer communication network, processes the messages, and forwards the messages to a receiver.[1] More specifically, Narasimhan describes that a source server (103) transmits a message to a destination server (105) which uses the forwarding service (123) to process and forward a processed message to the receiver.[2] Narasimhan also describes that the destination server (105) may return an acknowledgement to the source server (103) once the message has been forwarded.[3] However, Narasimhan is silent regarding the inclusion in the processed messages of information indicating the status thereof, or the forwarding of such information via the

---

[1] Narasimhan at column 1, lines 39-43.
[2] Narasimhan at column 4, line 42 – column 5, line 50.
[3] Narasimhan at column 5, line 60-67.

forwarding service (123). Therefore, <u>Narasimhan</u> fails to disclose the email events as claimed in amended Claim 1.

In rejecting the claims, the outstanding Office Action combined <u>Narasimhan</u> with <u>Moon</u> and <u>Pivowar</u>. <u>Moon</u> describes a mail forwarding system for retrieving e-mail stored on a private server (16) in a private network system (12) by a remote communicator (30).[4] <u>Moon</u> also describes that the system includes a mail forwarding program (32) that operates on a fixed computer (20), and in which a user enters parameters and routings.[5] Once enabled, <u>Moon</u> describes that the mail forwarding program (32) determines when an e-mail is received at the private server (16) and causes the fixed computer (20) to request the e-mail from the private server (16).[6] The mail forwarding program (32) then compares the e-mail with predetermined criteria to determine whether the e-mail is to be forwarded, and encrypts and forwards the e-mail to the remote communicator (30) accordingly.[7]

However, <u>Moon</u> does not describe forwarding transaction information indicating a status of the e-mail received at the fixed computer (20). Instead, <u>Moon</u> merely describes forwarding the e-mail messages themselves to a predetermined forwarding address, and then sending a separate paging message to a remote communicator (30) once the e-mail messages are stored at the predetermined address.[8] Nowhere, however, does <u>Moon</u> describe storing information at the predetermined address that indicates a status of the messages stored thereon. Conversely, amended Claim 1 recites forwarding information including the new email events and also recites that the new email events include *transactional information indicating the status of the email stored in the email datastore*. Therefore, <u>Moon</u> fails to disclose the claimed email events, and does not cure the above-noted deficiencies in <u>Narasimhan</u>.

---

[4] <u>Moon</u> at column 5, lines 64-67; see also Fig. 1.
[5] <u>Moon</u> at column 6, lines 1-10.
[6] <u>Moon</u> at column 7, lines 14-21.
[7] <u>Moon</u> at column 7, lines 24-45.
[8] <u>Moon</u> at column 7, lines 30-45.

Further, Pivowar describes a system (100) for synchronizing data among personal digital assistants (PDA's) (102) corresponding to a plurality of users.[9] However, Pivowar is silent regarding synchronization of information indicating a status of messages synchronized among the PDA's (102), and therefore does not remedy the above-noted deficiencies in Narasimhan and Moon. Therefore, no combination of Narasimhan, Moon and Pivowar describe every feature recited in amended Claim 1, and amended Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance, together with any claim depending therefrom.

Moreover, amended Claims 2-8 recite features substantially similar to those recited in amended Claim 1, and are thus believed to be in condition for allowance, together with any claim depending therefrom, for substantially the same reasons. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 1-8 and 31-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

As new Claims 47-54 recite features not disclosed in any art of record, new Claims 47-54 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

For the reasons discussed above, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-8 and 31-54 is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.

_____

Scott A. McKeown
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 42,866

Aldo Martinez
Registration No. 61,357

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 07/09)

---

[9] Pivowar at column 4, lines 8-15; see also Fig. 3.